



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/935,513	08/22/2001	Harlan Edgar Shannon	X-10576A	9165

7590

05/22/2002

Nelsen L Lentz
Eli Lilly and Company
Lilly Corporate Center
Drop Code 1104
Indianapolis, IN 46285

EXAMINER

CRIARES, THEODORE J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1617

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/935,513

Applicant(s)

SHANNON ET AL.

Examiner

Theodore J. Criares

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-91 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 49-91 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 45-48 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

CLAIMS 1-91 ARE PRESENTED FOR EXAMINATION

Claims 45-48 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 6-8. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. Claim 48 is objected to since it reads on claim 45. Prosecution of the application would be advanced if claim 48 is placed in independent form. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claims 49-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Evidence that claim 49, 70, 81 and 86 fail(s) to correspond in scope with that which applicant(s) regard as the invention can be found in Remarks filed in parent application SN 08/823,461, filed December 29, 1999. In that paper, applicant has stated at page 5 thereof that the invention is for the treatment of pain with olanzapine, an anti-psychotic agent not known to be useful for the treatment of pain. This statement indicates that the invention is different from what is defined in the present claim(s) because claims 49-91 are now drawn to olanzapine and anti-psychotic drugs such as tri-cyclic antidepressants which are not known to be anti-pain drugs. claim 49, 70, 81 and 86 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention.

Art Unit: 1617

Claims 49, 70, 81 and 86 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 49, 70, 81 and 86 recites the broad recitation anti-depressants, mixed serotonin-norepinephrine, serotonin receptor agonists, etc, and the claim also recites parenthetical examples thereof which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1617

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 49-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants' admissions and the Merck Index reference (hereinafter referred to as Merck).

Applicants admitted as stated above that their invention related to the use of olanzapine, an anti-psychotic agent, to treat pain not previously known.

Merck teaches at page 2421 that clozapine is a tricyclic antipsychotic agent.

As stated in *In re Kerkhoven*, 626 F.2d 846, 205 USPQ 1069, at page 1072 (CCPA 1980):

"It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. In *re Susi*, 58 CCPA 1074, 1079-80, 440 F.2d 442, 445, 169 USPQ 423, 426 (1971); *In re Crockett*, 47 CCPA 1018, 1020-21, 279 F.2d 274, 276-277, 126 USPQ 186, 188 (CCPA 1960). As this court explained in *Crockett*, the idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art."

Art Unit: 1617

In this application it would have been prima facie obvious to combine two anti-psychotic agents, i.e., olanzapine and clozapine a tricyclic antipsychotic.

There is a lack of teaching in the specification that the claimed active agents as claimed in claims 49-91 are also know to treat pain. The claimed compounds in claims 49-91 are not within the scope of applicants' definition of pain as set forth at column 6, lines 57-67.

Claim 1-44 are allowed.

SUMMARY

Claims 1-44 are allowed since it would be unobvious and patentable to combine an anti-psychotic drug and a pain relieving drug, such as aspirin, to treat pain. However, it would be obvious under Kerhoven to combine anti-psychotic drugs as claimed in claims 49-91.

Objection is made to claims 45-48.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Theodore J. Criares whose telephone number is 308-4607. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 A.M. to 5:00P.M. Monday through Thursday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minna Moeizie can be reached on 308-4612. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-6897 for regular communications and N/A for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/935,513

Page 6

Art Unit: 1617

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-1235.


Theodore J. Criares
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617

T.J.C.
May 14, 2002